hu

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,596	12/20/2001	Hung-Liang Chiu	56783 (71987)	9588

21874	7590	06/02/2005

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. BOX 55874
BOSTON, MA 02205

EXAMINER
WILLIAMS, JEFFERY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/026,596	CHIU ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Jeffery Williams	2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _20 December 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-15_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-15_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _20 December 2001_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

1   **DETAILED ACTION**

2

3   ***Specification***

4

5   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: multiple

6   instances of the non-English word "loginning". A more appropriate phrase would be

7   "logging into" or the equivalent. Appropriate correction is required.

8

9   The use of the trademark "R/3" has been noted in this application. It should be

10   capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

11   Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the

12   proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent

13   their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

14

15

16   ***Claim Objections***

17

18   Claims 1 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities:

19   multiple instances of the non-English word "loginning". A more

20   appropriate phrase would be "logging into" or the equivalent.

21   Claim 8, line 15, misspells "one" as "on".

22   Appropriate correction is required.

1   *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2

3   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

4   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
5   claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
6
7
8   Claims 4 and 12 contain the trademark/trade name "R/3". Where a trademark or

9   trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material

10   or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second

11   paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope

12   is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any

13   particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of

14   goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not

15   identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the

16   present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe an ERP system

17   and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

18

19

20   *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

21   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

22   obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

23   (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
24   forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
25   the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
26   invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
27   Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
28

1   **Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 11, and 13 – 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as**

2   **being unpatentable over Pancha et al., "System and Method for Coupling Remote**

3   **Data Stores and Mobile Devices via an Internet Based Server", U.S. Patent**

4   **6,823,373 B1 in view of See et al., "Deterministic User Authentication Service for**

5   **Communication Network", U.S. Patent 6,070,243.**

6

7   Regarding claim 8, Pancha et al. discloses a system designed to allow users with

8   terminal devices to access a resource system. A disclosed system server

9   ("authentication server") controls user access to the system by requiring user

10   authentication comprising an user id and password (Pancha et al., fig. 1, elem. 12; col.

11   6, lines 43-50). While Pancha et al. discloses a general overview of the authentication

12   server for granting/denying terminal access to a resource system, details regarding the

13   submission and verification of the user id and password are not disclosed. Specifically,

14   Pancha et al., does not describe in detail how the authentication server handles

15   valid/invalid submissions and a database for storing the id and passwords of system

16   users.

17   See et al., discloses in detail authentication methods necessary for enabling an

18   authentication server to grant/deny access to a resource system. See et al, discloses

19   the comparison of received passwords and ids from terminal devices with documented

20   passwords and ids located in a database. Also disclosed is a method for the delivery of

21   password submission success/failure messages to a user with the option to re-attempt

22   failed logins (See et al., col. 2, line 56 – col. 3, line 25; figs. 3A, 9).

1   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the

2 detailed authentication methods carried out by an authentication server of See et al.,

3 with the system for authenticating terminal devices to system resources of Pancha et al.

4 This would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been

5 motivated for the purposes of practical application to introduce into a system, describing

6 an authentication server in general, specific methods that would allow the authentication

7 server to authenticate terminal devices.

8   Thus the combination of Pancha et al. and See et al. discloses:

9   *a database for establishing user's data for storing and retrieving the resource*

10 *system* (See et al., fig. 3A, elem. 330);

11   *a receiving module for receiving user's data for loginning the resource system*

12 *inputted by the user at the terminal device* (Pancha et al., fig. 1, elem. 12);

13   *an identifying module for comparing the user's data transmitted from the*

14 *receiving module with the user's data stored in the database* (See et al., fig. 5, elem.

15 530);

16   *a replying module for responding according to compared results from the*

17 *identifying module, wherein if no user's data in the database matches the user's data*

18 *inputted by the user, the replying module sends a message of failure in loginning the*

19 *resource system to the user as the terminal device, and allows the user to re-input*

20 *user's data for loginning the resource system', if one of the user's data in the database*

21 *matches the user's data inputted by the user, the replying module generates a message*

22 *of permission for loginning the resource system* (See et al., fig. 4, elem. 440);

1   *a managing module having an authorization account for loginning the resource*

2   *system, wherein the managing module sends an authorization account to the resource*

3   *system according to the permission message transmitted from the replying module, so*

4   *as to allow the terminal device to interact with the resource system for data storage and*

5   *retrieval after the authorization account is identified by the resource systems* (See et

6   al., fig. 4, elem. 460);

7   *and a processing module for processing data generated by the interaction*

8   *between the terminal device and the resource system, so as to display the data in the*

9   *form of a web page on a browser of the terminal device* (Pancha et al., fig. 1, elem. 10).

10

11   Regarding claim 9, the combination of Pancha et al. and See et al. disclose:

12   *the authorization system of claim 8, wherein the web page is in the form of*

13   *extensible markup language (XML)* (Pancha et al., fig. 1, elems. 10, 18).

14

15   Regarding claim 9, the combination of Pancha et al. and See et al. disclose:

16   *the authorization system of claim 8, wherein the user's data include a dedicated*

17   *users name and a password corresponding to the user's name* (Pancha et al., col. 6,

18   lines 43-50).

19

20   Regarding claim 11, the combination of Pancha et al. and See et al. disclose:

21   *the authorization system of claim 8, wherein the resource system is an enterprise*

22   *resource planning (ERP) system* (Pancha et al., col. 5, lines 1-11).

1

2   Regarding claim 13, the combination of Pancha et al. and See et al. disclose:

3   *the authorization system of claim 8, wherein the authorization system is*

4   *established in a server host* (Pancha et al., fig. 1, elem. 12).

5

6   Regarding claim 14, the combination of Pancha et al. and See et al. disclose:

7   *the authorization system of claim 13, wherein the authorization system is*

8   *middleware* (Pancha et al., fig. 1, elem. 12). As disclosed, the system server (12)

9   infrastructure sits between clients and network applications and manages interaction.

10

11   Regarding claim 15, the combination of Pancha et al. and See et al. disclose:

12   *the authorization system of claim 8, wherein the authorization system and the*

13   *resource system are contained in world wide web* (Pancha et al., col. 4, lines 49-55).

14

15   Regarding claims 1 – 3, and 5 – 7, they are the method claims employed by the

16   apparatus claims above and are rejected for the same reasons.

17

18

19

20

21

1   **Claims 4 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

2   **over the combination of Pancha et al. and See et al. as applied to claims 1 – 3, 5 –**

3   **11, and 13 – 15 above, and further in view of Taylor et al., "Agent-Adapter**

4   **Architecture for Use in Enterprise Application Integration Systems", U.S. Patent**

5   **6,256,676 B1.**

6   Regarding claims 4 and 12, the combination of Pancha et al. and See et al.

7   disclose a system generically described as an enterprise resource planning system.

8   They do not disclose that the system is an R/3 system.

9   Taylor et al. discloses the teaching that an R/3 system is a well known and widely

10   accepted enterprise resource planning system (Taylor et al., col. 3, lines 1 – 47).

11   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ an R/3

12   system as disclosed by Taylor with the ERP system of the combination of Pancha et al.

13   and See et al. This would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art

14   would have been motivated to employ a particular ERP system that was favored by

15   those skilled in the industry.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1   ***Conclusion***

2

3   A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire **3** months (not less than 90

4   days) from the mailing date of this communication.

5

6   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

7   examiner should be directed to Jeffery Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-

8   7965. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

9   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

10   supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone

11   number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-

12   872-9306.

13   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

14   Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

15   published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

16   Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

17   For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

18   you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

19   Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

20

21
22   Jeffery Williams   **ANDREW CALDWELL**
23   571.272.7965   **SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**
24   5.20.2005